

Earlier this month I visited the Joseph House in Cincinnati, where Nathan Pelletier and his team of dedicated staff and volunteers provide addiction treatment and traditional housing.

A group of us meeting there, mostly veterans who are homeless or were homeless, listened to Britton Carter, who was formerly homeless. He completed his treatment program in the Joseph House. He now works as a case manager there helping other struggling veterans.

Veterans such as Mr. Carter have served our country with honor. We owe them support, and we owe them counseling when they return home. That is why I joined my colleagues in introducing the Veteran Housing Stability Act of 2015, which would make meaningful improvements to services for homeless veterans that would give veterans more access to permanent housing opportunities.

We know in the Veterans' Affairs Committee a number of things. We know that the unemployment rate of veterans is generally higher than society's unemployment rate. We know that veterans' suicide rate is higher than society's suicide rate. We know that veterans' drug addiction is higher than society's drug addiction rate. We know that veterans have suffered from PTSD and traumatic brain injury in numbers much higher than the general population. That is why we owe them so much. We in this body so rarely think about the cost of war.

We, as I said earlier, are willing to send more money to buy more weapons, to spend more money in armaments. We are not so generous when it comes time to take care of our veterans.

HONOR FLIGHTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the last point I wish to make before turning to the Senator from Oklahoma is something that we call Honor Flights. One of the great things that have come out of the National World War II Memorial is that men and women who have served in World War II are now getting the opportunity to go to visit this National World War II Memorial.

Retired Air Force Capt. Earl Morse, who worked in a VA clinic in Springfield, OH, would often talk with his World War II veteran patriots. He realized that for most of these veterans, their dream of seeing the memorial built on the National Mall would never come true. So one day in 2004, Captain Morse, a pilot and a member of the air club at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, asked one of his patients if he could personally fly him to Washington free of charge. The veteran, Mr. Loy, broke down in tears and accepted Earl's offer. Soon Earl was offering to fly other World War II veterans to visit the memorial and soliciting help from other pilots.

Eleven pilots from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base volunteered. In May

2005, the first Honor Flight took off from Springfield, OH.

A decade later, the Honor Flight Network is a national nonprofit that has flown 100,000 veterans, usually 40 or 50 or 60 at a time in a charter flight—always with a caretaker because these veterans are never young. They are World War II veterans. They have been out of the service now for 70 years at least.

The Honor Flight Program is in 41 States. I have had the honor of meeting a number of them. Toledo, OH, seems to be one which has particularly excelled and is encouraging local people, raising local money and getting every single veteran from northwest Ohio who was able to and wanted to join these Honor Flights.

I will quote one of these volunteers. Jim Salamon works for the Honor Flight Program in Dayton. He told me of a volunteer who goes by Ace and who works at an Arby's in Maryland and provides discounted meals for Honor Flight Program attendees. Jim said:

Ace is part of Honor Flight Dayton's family. We rely on Ace and he has not let us down. Over the last nine years Ace has saved us more than \$30,000 [because of Arby's donating these meals], which pays the cost of transporting 92 veterans.

With an average of 800 World War II veterans dying each day, the mission of the Honor Flight Program is more important now than ever.

I am thankful to those who have helped Honor Flight. I am thankful to those veterans and their families who have done so much.

I remind my colleagues, as they are always eager to vote for more money for weapons, that we should understand and think about the cost of war and take care of our returning servicemembers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there is a lot of news that is happening this week. There are a lot of things going on—an incredible celebration of veterans and the recognition they are very worthy of. That is the 1 percent in our Nation that actually secures the security of the rest of the 99 percent of our Nation.

We could not be more grateful—members of my own family, myself, and the proud people of Oklahoma who celebrate our veterans every single day of the year. We are very pleased to be able to do that.

OBAMACARE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we have a lot of information this week about ObamaCare hearings. They are again back in the news because the administration has filed a lawsuit against the Little Sisters of the Poor to compel

them to violate their faith and to be able to put into practice the principles of ObamaCare rather than their own personal faith.

So the Obama administration is taking a group of nuns called the Little Sisters of the Poor all the way to the Supreme Court to compel them to cave on their faith. That case actually includes four universities from my State of Oklahoma as well that are grouped together with this group from the Little Sisters of the Poor that will all have to go before the Supreme Court to validate their faith publicly in front of the Nation while the administration tries to tell them they can't practice their faith in America.

GITMO

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we also have news this week that the President is trying to push through Gitmo and he is trying to change Gitmo through some sort of Executive action. We don't know exactly what that is.

He seems to have this flippant attitude about what is going to happen at Guantanamo Bay, saying we can move them into the United States more cheaply. Well, I would tell you—as a person who has been to Guantanamo Bay and has seen that facility and am very aware of what is going on there—we are missing one big element. The terrorists do not know who the guards are at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Nor do they have access to their families.

And while they are infuriated about Gitmo, I promise you if those prisoners are moved into Colorado, Oklahoma or Kansas or any other place, the terrorists overseas won't rage about Gitmo anymore, they will then rage about Colorado or they will then rage about Illinois or wherever those prisoners are being held. They are not mad at Gitmo and the treatment there. They are mad that these terrorists, whom they have affection for, are being detained by the United States of America. Right now all of the individuals who are guarding those individuals and keeping them detained will no longer be hidden anymore because terrorists could linger around the outside of these facilities and contact the different guards that are coming in and out. Suddenly, the guards and their family members become exposed and the stakes for those individuals are exposed.

He is not thinking through the real consequences of flippantly moving these individuals into the United States. It is a big issue that we face.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, but I have to say this last weekend, as I was going through all the different news and the many things that we track, I was quite surprised last Friday afternoon at the way the President addressed something that this Nation has

discussed for 7 years—a pipeline permit, a permit called the Keystone XL Pipeline.

It is not a revolutionary thing. Quite frankly, I wish to show you something. These are all the pipelines that currently exist in the United States.

Right now, there are 19 international crossings of pipelines already coming into the United States, either from Canada into the northern part of the United States or from Mexico and from the South. There are already 19 of them. This would just be a 20th pipeline. There is nothing different about that.

There are 60,000 miles of crude oil pipelines in the United States right now. There are about 63,000 miles of refined product pipelines. If you want to go to natural gas, there are about 300,000 miles of natural gas pipelines already in the United States. Yet this pipeline is treated like some radical and new invention—as if we have never considered a pipeline before. But what surprised me so much wasn't the 2,600-plus days that this pipeline request sat on the President's desk. What surprised me was his reason for actually deciding not to do then the permits. That was the surprising part.

Quite frankly, last Friday afternoon as I heard the reasons, I went back, read the transcript, and these were the three reasons the President gave. He said: No. 1, "the pipeline wouldn't make a meaningful long-term contribution to our economy," and he encouraged us to pass a highway bill instead because it would provide more jobs. I don't remember ever discussing and saying: This pipeline is going to provide as many jobs as highways. That has never been discussed on this floor. It is apples and oranges. A highway bill is public funding. It is the taxpayers that actually fund transportation, and we should do highways in transportation.

This is a private project that was never intended to have as many jobs as a highway. It is a pipeline. So he said it is not going to provide enough jobs, and so he is not going to permit it.

The second reason he gave is this: "The pipeline would not lower gas prices for American consumers." He said gasoline prices are already low, and so we don't need this pipeline—as if gasoline prices don't rise and fall and we shouldn't plan forward for the future.

Do you want to know why gasoline prices are low right now? It is because over the decades, Americans have done this, and we have an efficient system of moving energy. By the way, the pipeline is the safest and least expensive way to move energy around our country. So what the President is saying is this: What we have is enough. I don't want to plan for the future anymore. I don't want to look for what is going to help our children. Our prices are low enough. I don't care what our children pay in the future days.

Well, that is absurd. But, quite frankly, the third one is the one that

was the most jarring to me, so I want to be able to say this statement to you. This is reason No. 3 the President gave: "Shipping crude oil into our country from unstable countries would not increase America's energy security." Let me read that to you again because I was so stunned by it. This is exactly from the President's speech off of the White House site. This is what the President said off this statement. He will not permit the Keystone Pipeline coming from Canada into the United States. He said shipping dirtier crude oil into our country would not increase America's energy security. He said:

What has increased America's energy security is our strategy over the past several years to reduce our reliance on dirty fossil fuels from unstable parts of the world.

Now, as I heard the President say that, I was a little taken aback because I don't remember any other President referring to Canada as an unstable part of the world from which we don't want to get our energy—an unstable country, and saying Canada was that country.

So I kept reading it and rereading it, thinking maybe he was implying something else, but the problem with that is he either means that Canada is an unstable country and we don't want to be reliant on them to get energy or he is saying the Middle East and other countries are unstable and we don't want to rely on them, so maybe we should buy from Canada instead. Either way it makes absolutely no sense.

But in its context—as I read it and read it and read it—the President stated that we don't need to have a Keystone Pipeline because Canada is unstable and we don't want to buy from unstable countries.

I would tell you that since the War of 1812 we have gotten along with Canada pretty well. We seem to have settled our differences about 1815, and they have been a very stable trading partner for us. It seems nonsensical to hear the President say: Because it doesn't produce enough jobs, I am not going to permit it. Because it won't affect the price of gasoline today, I won't permit it. And because Canada is unstable as a trading partner, I am not going to permit it.

The President can choose to do whatever he chooses to do, but answers like this make no sense to the American people and they make no sense to energy country when we understand full well the actual facts on the ground.

In recent days, we have actually started an energy swap with Mexico. Many people may not even know that. You see, all oil is not the same. Heavier crude oil is preferred by many of our refineries in the United States. Quite frankly, our refineries are capable of separating out more of the different minerals and such that are within heavy crude or what is often called sour crude. Our refineries prefer the heavier crude, much like what Canada produces and many parts of the United States and Mexico produces. Many of

the refineries in Mexico actually prefer the light sweet crude. We actually have more light sweet crude in America than we can use and what our refineries would prefer to have.

So in the past couple of months, Mexico and the United States have worked a swap from pipelines, where they are picking up about 75,000 barrels of light sweet and swapping us 75,000 barrels of heavier crude because they have a commodity we want and we have a commodity they want. That is how we could solve some of our energy issues, to actually look for what is the most efficient, whether it is purchasing it from a pipeline from Canada, which makes great economic sense to us, or exporting our oil anywhere else around the world, whether to Mexico or any other country.

This body knows full well the United States cannot sell our oil on the world market because we have a statute in place that would have us believe we are running out of oil rather than having a tremendous amount, which is factually true, and we have particular types of oil that like sweet crude many refineries around the world want. We actually have more of it than we can use. We should sell that. We should put that on the open market. It is cleaner, it is easier to refine, and it is a way to be able to stabilize jobs in the United States.

I have been in front of this body time after time with a simple statement: We can sell unleaded around the world, we can sell diesel around the world, we can sell coal around the world, and we can sell natural gas around the world, but for whatever reason we can't sell crude oil around the world. That makes absolutely no sense and we should fix it.

Tens of thousands of Americans have lost their jobs because this body has not acted on something as simple as being able to sell a product the world wants and we have on the world market. It is fixable. It is not about environmental disaster. The world is going to use oil. Even the administration and quite frankly even the President in his own speech made this statement last week: The truth is the United States will continue to rely on oil and gas. And so will the world. Until some other solution is out there, which no one sees currently on the horizon, we are going to continue to use oil and gas. Why don't we do it the cleanest way possible and why don't we provide American jobs while we are doing it?

It is fixable. It shouldn't be divisive. It is about putting Americans back to work and about helping our economy.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Massachusetts.

VETERANS DAY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, tomorrow is Veterans Day, and on Veterans